

REMARKS

Claims 17-26, 28-34 and 36-51 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-16 were previously cancelled and Claims 27 and 35 are currently cancelled. Claims 26 and 28-32 were previously withdrawn. Applicants note that the amendments filed in the First Response After-Final submitted on September 13, 2005 were not entered as indicated in the Advisory Action. Claims 17-25 and 33-51 were rejected, but the Examiner indicated Claims 17-25, 33, 34 and 36-49 contain allowable subject matter. The amendments to Claims 17, 20, 21, 22, 33, and 48 are the same as those previously presented in the First Response After-Final and are being presented again, as they have not yet been entered.

Applicants appreciated the opportunity to speak with the Examiner on October 12, 2005, where the re-introduction of the withdrawn claims and potential claim amendments were discussed. In view of these discussions, Applicants are additionally amending Claims 25-26 and 50 in the present supplemental response after-final. Support for the amendments is found throughout the specification and claims as originally filed, and specifically at Paragraphs 7 – 9, for example. Applicants believe that the amendments to Claims 26 and 50 are consonant with the limitations of the allowed claims. In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims are commensurate with those previously presented and that no consideration of new matter or further searching is required. Applicants believe that the amendments to the claims presented herein place the application in condition for allowance.

WITHDRAWAL OF RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

The Examiner previously imposed a restriction requirement between Inventions I and II. Claims 17-21 and 33-47 were drawn to Invention I, namely a method for forming an imide hydrogen storage material. Claims 26-32 were drawn to Invention II, a method of producing a source of hydrogen gas. Further, Claims 22-25 and 48-51 were determined to link Inventions I and II. The Examiner indicated that upon allowance of the linking claims, the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and the withdrawn claims will be entitled to examination. As the Examiner indicated that Claims 22-25 and 48-49 contain allowable subject matter, Applicants hereby request that the Examiner consider Claims 26 and 28-32. As indicated above, independent Claim 26 has been amended to have a scope commensurate with the allowed linking claims. Further, Claim 27 has been cancelled. Applicants request withdrawal of the restriction requirement and consideration and allowance of Claims 26 and 28-32.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 17-25 and 33-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, for indefiniteness due to the use of the language "at least one of". This rejection is respectfully traversed. As addressed in the First Response After-Final, Claims 17, 20, 21, 22, 33, and 48 are amended to address the Examiner's suggestion. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner objected to the preamble of Claim 25, which has been amended to correct the clerical error. Likewise, Claim 50 has been amended to recite "the group consisting of", *inter alia*. Such amendments to the claims address

informalities and should not be construed as narrowing amendments. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims and submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

Claims 50 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen, et al (2003/0129126), hereinafter the “Chen” reference. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 50 has been amended to recite a source of hydrogen having a hydrogenated state and dehydrogenated state. The hydrogenated state comprises an amide and a hydride. The dehydrogenated state comprises an imide represented by $M^c(NH)^{-2}_{c/2}$, where M represents at least one cationic species selected from the group consisting of Li, Mg, Na, B, Al, Be, and Zn, and c represents an average valence state of M. The imide is formed by reacting particles containing amide and particles containing hydride to release hydrogen and the imide is regenerated to the hydrogenated state by exposure to hydrogen to form at least one of the group consisting of: the amide and the hydride. In this regard, Applicants submit that the amendments to Claim 50 are commensurate with the limitations introduced to the allowed claims during prosecution, and should not require further consideration or searching. Further, the Chen reference lacks any disclosure, suggestion, or motivation to arrive at the invention as claimed in Claim 50 or its dependent Claim 51. The Chen reference teaches away from the reversible storage of hydrogen in an imide in a dehydrogenated state, as addressed in the previous Response After-Final. The Chen

reference does not disclose or suggest a hydrogen source that has a hydrogenated state comprising an amide and a hydride and a dehydrogenated state having an imide that can be exposed to hydrogen to form the starting materials of the amide and hydride compounds. Not only does Chen fail to disclose each limitation as recited in Claim 50, but when Chen is considered in its entirety, it teaches away from a reversible hydrogen storage imide material.

Since Chen fails to provide any disclosure or motivation to form a hydrogen source having a dehydrogenated state comprising an imide, Chen does not anticipate or render independent Claim 50 obvious. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 50 and its dependent Claim 51 are not anticipated nor are they rendered obvious by the Chen reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of these claims.

REJECTION UNDER DOUBLE PATENTING

In the First Response After-Final, Applicants previously submitted a Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c).

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 17-25, 33, 34 and 36-49 contain allowable subject matter. Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration of the claims and the indication of allowable subject matter. Applicants have amended withdrawn Claims 26 and 28-32 to include limitations similar to those present in the linking claims. Further, Applicants have also amended Claims 50 and 51 to include limitations similar to those of

the allowed claims indicated above. Therefore, Claims 17-26, 28-34, and 36-51 should now be in condition for allowance.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 13, 2005

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

By: 

Anna M. Budde
Reg. No. 35,085

Jennifer M. Woodside Wojtala
Reg. No. 50,721

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:
Kathryn A. Marra
General Motors Corporation
Legal Staff - Mail Code 482-C23-B21
PO Box 300 - 300 Renaissance Center
Detroit, Michigan 48265-3000
Ph: 313-665-4708
Fax: 313-665-4976

JMW/slg